

Origin of classical structure from inflation

Claus Kiefer^a

^aFaculty for Physics, University of Freiburg,
Hermann-Herder-Strasse 3, 79104 Freiburg, Germany

According to the inflationary scenario, all structure in the Universe can be traced back to quantum fluctuations of the metric and scalar field(s) during inflation. The seeds of this structure can be observed as classical anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background. I briefly review how the transition from the inherent quantum nature of these fluctuations to classical behaviour comes about. Two features play a crucial role: Firstly, the quantum state of the fluctuations becomes highly squeezed for wavelengths that exceed the Hubble radius. Secondly, decoherence due to other fields distinguishes the field-amplitude basis as the classical pointer basis. I also discuss the entropy of the fluctuations and make a brief comparison with chaotic systems.

The assumption that the Universe underwent an accelerated (“inflationary”) expansion during its early phase provides a theoretically satisfying scenario for a causal explanation of structure formation [1]. How does this work?

It is evident that all pre-existing structure would have been damped away during the rapid inflationary expansion. The only exception are the ubiquitous *quantum fluctuations* of fundamental fields. In fact, the central idea is that all observed structure in the Universe (galaxies, clusters of galaxies, etc.) has its origin in quantum fluctuations that are present during inflation. These fluctuations can be observed as classical stochastic fluctuations in the anisotropy spectrum of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB). Such observations are made both from space through satellite missions such as COBE (and the planned missions PLANCK and MAP) as well as from earth-bound telescopes. The main issue to be addressed here is: How can the transition from quantum to classical fluctuations be understood? The analysis will consist of two parts: Firstly, the dynamics of the fluctuations as an isolated system is discussed. Secondly, their interaction with other fields (“environment”) is taken into account.

The simplest example, which nevertheless captures the essential physical features, is the model of a real massless (minimally coupled) scalar field ϕ in a flat Friedmann Universe with scale fac-

tor a . It readily applies to the case of gravitational waves and can be extended in a straightforward way to scalar perturbations by employing a gauge-invariant formalism [2,3]. The action reads

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi . \quad (1)$$

It turns out convenient to introduce the rescaled variable $y \equiv a\phi$ (the corresponding momenta thus being related by $p_y = a^{-1}p_\phi$). Assuming for simplicity that the volume of space is finite, the corresponding Hamiltonian can be written as a sum

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} H_{\mathbf{k}} , \quad (2)$$

where

$$H_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(p_{\mathbf{k}} p_{\mathbf{k}}^* + k^2 y_{\mathbf{k}} y_{\mathbf{k}}^* + \frac{a'}{a} [y_{\mathbf{k}} p_{\mathbf{k}}^* + p_{\mathbf{k}} y_{\mathbf{k}}^*] \right) \quad (3)$$

and $p_{\mathbf{k}}$ is given by $p_{\mathbf{k}} = y'_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{a'}{a} y_{\mathbf{k}}$; it is the Fourier transform of $p_y = y' - \frac{a'}{a} y$, the momentum conjugate to y . Primes refer to derivatives with respect to conformal time $\eta \equiv \int dt/a$. All quantities are evaluated in Fourier space. The physical wavelength of a perturbation is $\lambda_{phys} = a/k$. It is well known from quantum optics that a Hamiltonian of this type generates a *two-mode squeezed state*. The application of this formalism to cosmological fluctuations was discussed extensively in [3–5].

What is the initial quantum state for the perturbations? A natural assumption would cer-

tainly be to take the vacuum state for the fluctuations at the onset of inflation. This will be done here, but it must be emphasised that the results are insensitive to the exact choice of initial condition: Inflation leads to a very high squeezing in momentum and, unless the initial state is “fine-tuned” to be extremely squeezed in position, all differences in the initial state are damped out by inflation. It is of course a deep and non-trivial question why inflation does occur in the first place. This seems to be related with the origin of irreversibility in the Universe, a question that can be dealt with satisfactorily only in the framework of quantum gravity [6].

The squeezed vacuum can be written, in the Schrödinger picture, as a Gaussian wave function for each mode [7],

$$\psi_{k0} = \left(\frac{2\Omega_R}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} \exp(-[\Omega_R + i\Omega_I]|y_k|^2) . \quad (4)$$

Since modes with different wave vectors $\mathbf{k}$ decouple, I shall sometimes skip the index $\mathbf{k}$ (or k) in the following. The wave function (4) can be written in terms of the squeezing parameters r and φ in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0 = & \left(\frac{2k}{\pi[\cosh 2r + \cos 2\varphi \sinh 2r]} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \times \exp \left(-k \frac{1 - e^{2i\varphi} \tanh r}{1 + e^{2i\varphi} \tanh r} |y|^2 \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Squeezing can equivalently be expressed in terms of “particle creation” with average particle number $N(\mathbf{k}) \approx e^{2r}/4 \approx aH_I/4k$, where H_I denotes the Hubble parameter of inflation, and the limit of large squeezing $r \rightarrow \infty$ is taken. This corresponds to modes with wavelengths bigger than the horizon (after the first Hubble-radius crossing during inflation). Due to this large squeezing (for the largest cosmological scales one has $r_k \geq 100$), the system already exhibits a certain degree of classicality by itself, called “decoherence without decoherence” in [5]. In the Heisenberg picture, this is recognised as the negligibility of the decaying mode: If terms proportional to e^{-r} can be neglected, position and momentum approximately commute. Thought experiments and the

analogy with a free quantum particle can be invoked to illustrate this effective classicality [7–9]. This classicality is of a stochastic nature and different from, for example, the classicality associated with coherent-state evolution. Due to this large squeezing (which one can recognise directly from the Wigner ellipse in phase space), the system exhibits many similarities with a chaotic system, although it is not chaotic, but classically unstable. This will be of relevance for an understanding of the entropy, see below. It must also be emphasised that these properties (random amplitude and fixed phase) are preserved for a sufficient time after the modes re-enter the horizon in the post-inflationary phase [8] and lead to a distinctive signature of inflationary models in the form of peaks exhibited by the CMB-anisotropy spectrum.

Classical properties arise from quantum systems usually through the ubiquitous interaction with environmental degrees of freedom – the irreversible process of decoherence [10]. Although, as discussed above, the system exhibits classical features by itself, the interaction with other degrees of freedom is unavoidable, and it is important to check that this influence does not spoil the properties of the isolated system. Since the relevant perturbation modes are outside the horizon during inflation, direct causal processes cannot occur and relaxation is therefore negligible. However, quantum entanglement can and does indeed occur [7]. Since all relevant interaction of the perturbations with other degrees of freedom couple field variables (as opposed to the corresponding momenta), the classical pointer basis is given by the field amplitudes $|y_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$. The corresponding operator thus commutes with the interaction Hamiltonian,

$$[H_{int}, y_{\mathbf{k}}] \approx 0 . \quad (6)$$

Moreover, in the large-squeezing limit, the field amplitudes at different times commute,

$$[y_{\mathbf{k}}(t_1), y_{\mathbf{k}}(t_2)] \approx 0 , \quad (7)$$

and therefore constitute quantum-nondemolition variables [11]. Of course, the last two equations together imply that $y_{\mathbf{k}}$ commutes with the full Hamiltonian, which is therefore an approximate

constant of motion. The easiest interaction with an environment, giving a lower bound on decoherence, is a linear coupling with other fields like in quantum Brownian motion [10]. In such a model one finds for the decoherence time [7]

$$t_D \approx \frac{\lambda_{phys}}{ge^r} \approx (gH_I)^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

where g denotes the (dimensionless) coupling constant. If one assumes that g is of order one, one has $t_D \approx H_I^{-1}$, i.e., the decoherence timescale is set by the Hubble parameter of inflation and independent of the details of the interaction! After the perturbation has remained outside the horizon for a couple of e-folds, the $|y_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ become a perfectly classical pointer basis. For this reason, the results drawn from the discussion of the system itself remain unchanged, which would not be true if, for example, the particle-number basis would be the classical basis. The interaction constitutes an “ideal measurement”: All interferences disappear from the system, while all probabilities (predictions of the inflationary scenario) remain unchanged, see [7] for a detailed conceptual discussion.

The above results are of direct relevance for the calculation of the entropy possessed by the perturbations [12]. In the following I shall focus on the gravitons, but a similar discussion can be made for the matter perturbations. Clearly, for the isolated system the entropy is and remains zero, since the system is in a pure state [13]. A non-vanishing entropy arises from the interaction with the environment, since then the perturbations become an open system to which one can only attribute a (reduced) density matrix [10]. The maximal entropy for each mode is obtained if the squeezed ellipse in phase space is coarse-grained to a big circle, yielding an entropy $S_k \approx 2r_k$. This would mean that the squeezing phase would be maximally randomised and that therefore some features which would otherwise be present in the CMB anisotropy spectrum would be absent. As the discussion in [12] demonstrates, the actual entropy is much smaller than its maximum value and lies between zero and $2r_k$. The point is that a few bits of information loss are sufficient for decoherence, and classicality does al-

ready emerge if the entropy is (in a logarithmic sense) much bigger than about $1 - \ln 2 \approx 0.31$.

The entropy is calculated via the von Neumann formula $S = -\text{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$, where ρ is the reduced density matrix, and use is being made of explicit formulae derived in [14]. The derivation confirms the expectation that the entropy is roughly given by the logarithm of the ellipse in phase space, whose minor axis approaches a finite value due to decoherence (as opposed to ongoing squeezing).

In addition to environmental decoherence, there might also be some information loss due to the presence of a secondary gravitational-wave background caused by postinflationary processes, since the corresponding gravitons are indistinguishable from the gravitons belonging to the primordial background [12]. The result for the entropy depends on the corresponding particle numbers, and various cases are discussed in [12]. The general expectation is that the secondary background is much smaller than the primary one, so that the squeezing is still recognisable.

It turns out that, after a complicated transitory phase, the entropy production rate is given by the Hubble parameter, i.e. $\dot{S} \approx H$, in accordance with the result that the decoherence time is proportional to H^{-1} . During inflation, $H = H_I \approx \text{const.}$, and the entropy production is linear in t . In the post-inflationary phases, the Hubble parameter is proportional to $1/t$, and the entropy increases only logarithmically in time.

It is of interest that the situation is very similar to chaotic systems [15]. The role of the Hubble parameter is there played by the Lyapunov exponent λ . One can define a measure of entropy production, the so-called Kolmogorov entropy, see e.g. [16], which measures how chaotic a dynamical system is, i.e. how fast information about the state is lost. The Kolmogorov entropy corresponds to the entropy production referred to above. The reason for this analogy is the fact that the situation in phase space is similar in both cases.

It is a pleasure to thank David Polarski and Alexei Starobinsky for their collaboration during which the results reported in this contribution

have been obtained. I am also grateful to David Polarski and Sebastian Schlicht for a careful reading of this manuscript.

16. H.G. Schuster, *Deterministic Chaos*, VCH, Weinheim, 1995, Sect. 5.2.

REFERENCES

1. A. Linde, *Particle physics and inflationary cosmology*, Harwood, New York, 1990; E. Kolb and M. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1990; G. Börner and S. Gottlöber (eds.), *The Evolution of the Universe*, John Wiley, Chichester, 1997.
2. V. Mukhanov, H. Feldman, and R. Brandenberger, *Phys. Rep.* 215 (1992) 203.
3. A. Albrecht, P. Ferreira, M. Joyce, and T. Prokopec, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994) 4807.
4. L.P. Grishchuk and Yu.V. Sidorov, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 6 (1989) L161.
5. D. Polarski and A.A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 13 (1996) 377.
6. H.D. Zeh, *The physical basis of the direction of time*, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
7. C. Kiefer and D. Polarski, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* 7 (1998) 137.
8. C. Kiefer, J. Lesgourgues, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 15 (1998) L67.
9. D. Polarski, *Phys. Lett. B* 446 (1999) 53.
10. D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, and H.D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
11. C. Kiefer, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* 7 (1998) 455.
12. C. Kiefer, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinsky, *Entropy of gravitons produced in the early Universe*, gr-qc/9910065, to appear in *Phys. Rev. D*.
13. J. Lesgourgues, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 14 (1997) 881.
14. E. Joos and H.D. Zeh, *Z. Phys. B* 59 (1985) 223.
15. W.H. Zurek and J.P. Paz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72 (1994) 2508; G. Casati and B.V. Chirikov, *ibid.* 75 (1995) 350; W.H. Zurek and J.P. Paz, *ibid.* 75 (1995) 351.